REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance the subject patent application. Claims 1-39 were pending in the application prior to this amendment. Claims 8, 9, 13, 18, 33, and 34 were amended to correct grammatical errors and to further point out the subject matter of Applicant's invention. Claims 10 and 38 were canceled. No claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-37, and 39 are pending.

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6, 9-10, 13, 16-19, 21-28, 31, 33-34, 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,018,711 to French Saint George et al. (hereinafter referred to as "St. George '711") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,030 to French Saint George et al. (hereinafter referred to as "St. George '030"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The '711 Reference

St. George '711 describes at col. 3, lines 15-67 through col. 4, lines 1-67, a speech interface for accessing a speech recognizer that is only operable for receiving speech input during a limited time recognition window, or duration. A graphic representation of the amount of time available to accept user input is displayed to a user. The graphic representation diminishes in size as available time for input diminishes, providing a user with an indication of the available time to provide speech input. St. George '711 further describes providing an auditory interface with a time-dependent auditory pattern to represent the amount of time available to accept speech input. A change in auditory pattern provides a user

with an indication of the available time to provide speech input. At the end of the limited time duration for speech recognition, the speech input is captured and the recognition window is closed. St. George '711 describes that a user can reset the graphic that represents the available time to provide speech input by depressing a key or by touching a touch sensitive region of a display.

The '030 Reference

St. George '030 describes at col. 8, lines 23-67 through col. 10, lines 1-67, a system for managing speech and audio prompts in response to a user's current input modality – including, speech input and tactile input. After a user enables the speech recognition modality, an audible beep is played to indicate that the speech recognizer window is open. Once to the speech recognition modality is activated, a graphic display provides visual feedback to indicate that speech input was detected. If valid speech input is received, the system executes the located command.

Claim Analysis

Independent claim 1 describes a speech recognition system that requires "a user interface to provide visual and auditory feedback indicating whether the speech recognition engine recognizes the utterance, the user interface being configured to play an audible sound indicating recognition of the utterance and to display a countdown graphic that changes with lapsing of the response time". Thus, as response time diminishes, a graphic changes to indicate a reduced amount of time for a user to provide speech input, and in response to recognizing an utterance, an audible sound is played.

In addressing claim 1, the Office admits that St. George '711 does not teach a user interface to provide visual and auditory feedback indicating whether the speech recognition engine recognizes the utterance. Instead, the Office relies on St. George '030 for this teaching. The Office concludes that because St. George '030 describes providing feedback to the user of a speech recognition system, that would have been obvious to combine this teaching with St. George '711 to provide feedback to the user of a speech recognition system. This conclusion is unsupportable.

As discussed above, St. George '030 provides visual feedback to indicate that speech input was detected, and if a valid command is received, the system executes the command. Thus, the system of St. George '030 may never play an audible sound in response to recognizing an utterance. Therefore, neither St. George '711 nor St. George '030 teach or suggest "in response to recognizing an utterance, an audible sound is played", as claim 1 requires.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) a rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. In addition, these claims include features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination.

For example, dependent **claim 2** describes a speech recognition system that requires "the user interface restarts the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes the utterance".

In addressing claim 2, the Office admits that neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 teach a user interface that restarts a countdown graphic in response to recognition an utterance by the speech recognition engine. Instead, the Office

concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the user interface of St. George '711 to implement the visual and auditory feedback is taught by St. George '030, and to further modify the system to allow for the user interface restoring the countdown graphic. This conclusion is unsupportable for the following reasons.

As discussed above, St. George '711 describes that a user resets a graphic that represents available time to provide speech input by pressing key or touching a touch sensitive region of a display. St. George '030 is completely silent with respect to a graphic that represents available time to provide speech input. Resetting a recognition window by physically pressing a key or touch sensitive area on a screen, is not "restart[ing a] countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes the utterance", as claim 2 requires. Thus, the system of St. George '711 in view of the system of St. George '030 may never restart a countdown graphic in response to recognizing an utterance.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 2 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 as amended describes a speech recognition system that requires "a user interface to display a countdown graphic that changes with lapsing of the response time, wherein the user interface restarts the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes one of the utterances".

As discussed above with respect to claim 2, Office admits that neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 teach a user interface that restarts a graphic in the event an utterance is recognized. For the reasons discussed above in reference to claim 2, the cited combination does not teach or suggest the features of claim 9.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 9 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 13, 16 and 17 depend from claim 9 and are allowable virtue of this dependency. In addition, these claims include features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination.

For example, dependent claim 13 describes a speech recognition system that requires "the user interface plays an audible sound when the speech recognition engine recognizes one of the utterances within the predetermined response time". For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination may never play an audible sound in response to recognizing an utterance. Thus, claim 13 is allowable over St. George '711 in view of St. George '030.

Accordingly, for this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 13 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 18 as amended describes a user interface that requires "the user interface plays an audible sound when the speech recognition engine recognizes one of the utterances within the predetermined response time". For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination may never play an audible sound in response to recognizing an utterance. Therefore, the features of claim 13 are allowable over St. George '711 in view of St. George '030. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 18 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 19, 21 and 22 depend from claim 18 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. In addition, these claims include features that are not taught or suggested by St. George '711 in view of St. George '030.

For example, dependent claim 19 requires "the graphic progress bar is lengthened to its initial position after recognized user input." In addressing claims 2, 28 and 36, the Office admitted that neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 teach the user interface restarts the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes the utterance.

For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2, the systems described by the cited combination may never lengthen a graphic progress bar to its initial position after recognizing user input, as claim 19 requires. Therefore, the cited combination does not teach or suggest the features of claim 19. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 19 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 23 describes a user interface that requires "an audio generator to emit an audible sound when the speech recognition system recognizes the utterance". For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination may never generate an audible sound in response to recognizing an utterance. Therefore, claim 23 is allowable over St. George '711 in view of St. George '030. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 23 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 24-26 depend from claim 23 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. In addition, these claims include features that are not taught or suggested by St. George '711 in view of St. George '030.

Independent claim 27 describes a vehicle computer system that requires "a user interface to provide visual and auditory feedback indicating whether an utterance is recognized, the user interface being configured to play an audible sound indicating recognition of the utterance". For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, St. George '711 in view of St. George '030 does not

describe the idea of a user interface which indicates recognition of an utterance biplane an audible sound. Thus, claim 27 is allowable over the cited combination. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 27 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 28, 31 and 32 depend from claim 27 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. In addition, these claims recite features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination.

For example, claim 28 requires "the user interface restarts the graphic in the event the utterance is recognized". As discussed above with respect to claim 2, Office admits that neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 teach a user interface that restarts a graphic in the event an utterance is recognized. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2, claim 28 is not obvious over the cited combination. Accordingly, for this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 28 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, dependent claim 32 requires "the speech recognition system is initially in a sleep mode and is awakened to an active mode upon detection of a starter utterance, the user interface plays another audible sound indicating that the speech recognition system is in the active mode in the event the starter utterance is recognized".

In addressing this claim, the Office on page 5, section 8, admits that neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 teach a speech recognition system that is initially in a sleep mode that is awakened to an active mode upon detection of a starter utterance. Thus, the cited combination of St. George '711 in view of St. George '030 does not teach or suggest the features of claim 32. Accordingly, for

this additional reasons, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 32 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 34 describes a method that requires "playing a sound when an audible utterance is recognized". As discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination may never play a sound when an audible utterance is recognized. Thus, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 34 is not obvious over St. George '711 in view of St. George '030. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 34 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 36 depends from claim 34 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency. In addition, this claim includes features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination.

For example, dependent claim 36 requires "reset in the graphic when an audible utterance is recognized". As discussed above with respect to claim 2, the Office admits that neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 teach a user interface that resets a graphic in response to recognizing an utterance. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2, claim 36 is not obvious over the cited combination. Accordingly, for this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 36 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-5, 7-8, 11-12, 15, 20, 29-30, 32, 35, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over St. George '711 in view of St. George '030 and further in view of U.S. patent No. 6,075,534 to VanBuskirk (hereinafter referred to as VanBuskirk). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

VanBuskirk describes at col. 4, lines 15-51, a graphical user interface for speech recognition application that includes a volume meter. Sequences of colors are displayed in the volume meter to represent volume level of dictated speech. VanBuskirk further describes that the volume level of dictated speech can also be represented by a moving ribbon of line patterns in the volume meter. When the speech recognition application is asleep, VanBuskirk describes that text can be displayed in the volume meter to prompt the user to wake-up the application by either dictating a wake-up command or using a device to click on the volume meter.

Dependent claims 4, 11, 20, 29, and 37, each depend from a base claim that requires either (a) "the user interface being configured to play an audible sound indicating recognition of the utterance", (b) "restart[ing] the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes one of the utterances", (c) "play[ing] and audible sound when the speech recognition engine recognizes the utterance within the predetermined response time", or (d) "playing a sound when an audible utterance is recognized". As discussed above, neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 disclose the features contained in these base claims.

VanBuskirk is primarily relied on for describing a minibar graphic that provides status information of the functions of the recognition system. As discussed above, VanBuskirk describes using a sequence of colors or a moving ribbon of line patterns to represent volume levels of dictated speech. Thus, the system of VanBuskirk may never provide visual and auditory feedback indicating whether the speech recognition engine recognizes an utterance. Therefore, neither St. George '711, nor St. George '030, nor VanBuskirk describe the idea of

providing visual and auditory feedback indicating whether the speech recognition engine recognizes an utterance.

Furthermore, in addressing claims 4, 11, 20, 29 and 37, the Office admits that neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 teach interface displays visual elements in a first color in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes an utterance. Instead, the Office relies on VanBuskirk for this description to conclude that these claims are obvious over the cited combination. This conclusion is unsupportable.

Claims 4, 11, 20, 29 and 37 respectfully describe an interface or graphic that changes color in response to recognizing an utterance. As discussed above, the VanBuskirk uses a minibar icon to display separate colors or a ribbon of line patterns to represent volume level of dictated speech. The minibar icon of VanBuskirk may never change from a first color to a second color in response to recognizing an utterance. Therefore, the cited combination does not disclose the idea an interface or graphic that changes color in response to recognizing an utterance.

Accordingly, for this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 4, 11, 20, 29, and 37 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 5, 12, 30, and 35, each depend from a base claim that requires either (a) "the user interface being configured to play an audible sound indicating recognition of the utterance", (b) "restart[ing] the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes one of the utterances", (c) "play[ing] and audible sound when the speech recognition engine recognizes why the utterance is within the predetermined response time", or (d) "playing a sound when an audible utterance is recognized". As discussed above, the cited

combination of St. George '711 in view of St. George '030 and further in view of VanBuskirk does not disclose the features contained in these base claims.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 5, 12, 30, and 35 are improper and should withdrawn.

Dependent claim 8 depends from claim 1 and for the reasons described above with respect to claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 20, 29, 30, 35, and 37, claim 8 is allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. In addition, claim 8 includes features that when taken in combination with those of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by the cited combination.

Claim 8 describes a speech recognition system that requires "the user interface plays another audible sound indicating that the user speech recognition engine is in the active mode in the event the speech recognition engine recognizes a starter utterance". The cited combination does not teach or suggest these features for the following reasons.

In addressing claim 8, the Office admits that neither St. George '711 nor St. George '030 teach a speech recognition engine that is initially in a sleep mode and is awakened to inactive mode upon depression of a button. Instead, the Office relies on VanBuskirk for this teaching to conclude that the elements of claim 8 are obvious over St. George '711 in view of St. George '030 and further in view of VanBuskirk. This conclusion is unsupportable.

As discussed above, neither St. George '711 nor St. George '030 describes the user interface that plays an audible sound in response to recognizing an utterance. Thus, neither St. George '711 or St. George '030 will play "another audible sound indicating that the speech recognition engine is in the active mode

in the event speech recognition engine recognizes a starter utterance", as claim 8 requires.

VanBuskirk describes that text can be displayed in the volume meter to prompt the user for proper input to wake-up the speech recognition application. Proper input includes dictating a predetermined wake-up command or using a device to click on the volume meter. Prompting a user for proper input and recognizing that input is not the same as playing an audible sound in response to recognizing a starter utterance. Thus, the system of VanBuskirk may never generate and audible sound to indicate that the speech recognition is in inactive mode when the speech recognition engine recognizes a starter utterance. Therefore, claim 8 is not obvious the cited combination of St. George '711 in view of St. George '030 and further in view of VanBuskirk.

Accordingly, for this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 8 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-9, 11-37, and 39 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any questions remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10-30-2000

By: _____

Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44,421
(509) 324-9256